

TIT/HEP-313/COSMO-63
February 5, 2008

On Divergence of Decoherence Factor in Quantum Cosmology

TAKASHI OKAMURA

*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology,
Oh-okayama, Meguroku, Tokyo 152, Japan*

ABSTRACT

To discuss the quantum to classical transition in quantum cosmology, we study the decoherence factor and the peak of the Wigner function, which respectively represent the degree of decoherence and the degree to which the classical motion of the Universe is defined, in a Robertson-Walker universe model coupled with a scalar field. It is known that the decoherence factor is divergent in some cases. This implies that perfect decoherence occurs, and classical correlation criterion fails. In this paper we discuss the divergence of the decoherence factor in some detail and obtain the constraints for decoherence factor to be convergent, making use of the arbitrariness defining the reduced density matrix. The result is discussed in connection with the arbitrariness of *system/environment* splitting.

1. Introduction

Many researchers accept that quantum theory can be applied to all events and even to the entire Universe. However, macroscopic objects, including our universe, behave classically. If we seriously consider quantum theory as a universal theory, it is a crucial problem to derive classical behavior from quantum theory under some suitable conditions.

To characterize classicality, two criteria are generally used as fundamental, classical correlation and quantum decoherence.

Strong correlation is necessary to predict from the wave function of the Universe. It is a reason that we cannot have probabilistic predictions from the wave function of the Universe that is a single system and can only predict the event whose (conditional) probability is almost unity, *i.e.*, the strong peak of the wave function or Wigner function.^[1,2] The existence of correlation between configurations and momenta along a classical trajectory implies that the system follows classical equations of motion. In order to analyze whether a given wave function has classical correlation, we often examine the peak of the Wigner function.^[3]

We may expect that the WKB state is classical in a sense and that the Wigner function associated with it shows classical correlation. However, the Wigner function of the WKB state not only has no peak around the classical trajectory in phase space but also oscillates very rapidly.^[4,5] The cause of these phenomena is the existence of quantum interference. To acquire classical correlation, we need some coarse graining.^[6]

Quantum decoherence induces the coarse graining necessary for the Wigner function to have a peak.^[6] And originally, quantum decoherence is necessary for individual systems in a composite system to have definite characters,^[7] and necessary to assign the probability into each history of the system.^[8]

Classical correlation and quantum decoherence are not only complementary but also exclusive in part, because decoherence induces a coarse graining on the Wigner

function, and the coarse graining leads to a spreading of the Wigner function.^{[6][9]} Let us assume that we have a superposed state in the position representation, and after the decoherence mechanism acts, its density matrix associated with the state is diagonalized in that representation. Therefore we have a classical ensemble consisting of the states whose positions are decided. Each state is a position eigenstate so that the conjugate momentum is indefinite. So we have no classical correlation between positions and momenta in phase space. To obtain a definite classical correlation, decoherence should be moderate.

A mechanism leading to decoherence is the “environment induced superselection rule”.^[10] Macroscopic objects are not isolated from their environment. We finally need reduced information because we cannot observe the entire Universe. This inevitable interaction with the environment induces non-unitary evolution on the relevant degrees of freedom called the *system*.

This mechanism has been applied to quantum cosmology.^[11–16] There, decoherence of the spacetime and classical correlation, *i.e.*, derivation of the semiclassical Einstein equation, has been discussed. Decoherence and correlation of the scale factor of the Robertson-Walker universe by an inhomogeneous scalar field as environment are usually examined under the WKB ansatz, and the degree of decoherence is expressed by the overlap integral, called the decoherence factor, between the states of scalar fields which have evolved on different WKB histories.

In some cosmological models, we face perfect decoherence of the scale factor.^{[12][15][16]} Because we deal with a system of an infinite numbers of degrees of freedom, we essentially need regularization and renormalization procedures. However, this feature is not removed by the standard renormalization procedure.^[16] Further this is an undesirable feature for classical correlation. So we usually introduce a cutoff to the degrees of freedom of scalar modes as the environment. Unfortunately, whether the scale factor behaves classically is strongly dependent on the choice of cutoff.^{[11][12][6]} Meanwhile, we have a model that shows moderate decoherence. Several authors related the cause of perfect decoherence to the lack of adiabaticity of the

WKB histories.^{[15][16]}

We always have arbitrariness in defining the reduced density matrix.^[17] The reduced density matrix may be defined by integrating out the modes $\{\phi_n\}$ as the environment,

$$\rho_{red}(a, a') = \int [\prod_n d\phi_n] \rho(a, \{\phi_n\}; a', \{\phi_n\}) .$$

Alternatively, we may define it by integrating out $\{f_n = ag(a)\phi_n\}$ as the environment,

$$\bar{\rho}_{red}(a, a') = \int [\prod_n df_n (ag(a))^{-1/2} (a'g(a'))^{-1/2}] \rho(a, \{\frac{f_n}{ag(a)}\}; a', \{\frac{f_n}{a'g(a')}\}) .$$

The arbitrariness of the choice of the environment variables brings change to the conjugate momenta so that the portion spanned by the Hilbert space of the system within the total Hilbert space changes. Except for the coincidence limit, $a = a'$, $\rho_{red} \neq \bar{\rho}_{red}$. Then, is it a natural choice which reduced density matrix we use for the decoherence argument of the scale factor? Laflamme and Louko^[17] assert that the choice $g(a) = 1$ is preferable to $g(a) = a^{-1}$ because the decoherence induced by the former is more directly related to particle production.

In this paper, through a model consisting of a scale factor and free scalar field with curvature coupling, we somewhat carefully discuss the question of which choice for reduced density matrix leads to moderate decoherence. The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II we define the decoherence factor induced by integrating out the rescaled scalar field according to the usual procedure. In Sec.III we relate the variance of Gaussian solution for the Schrödinger equation of rescaled scalar field to mode functions that are solutions of Klein-Gordon equation, and review the known results briefly. In Sec.4, using the constraints on large frequency behavior of the mode function by Bogoliubov implementability, we obtain the constraints on rescaling $g(a)$ for the scalar field and the curvature coupling constant. Sec.V is devoted to a summary.

2. Decoherence Functional

We consider the Robertson-Walker universe with a free scalar field, and examine the decoherence of the scale factor by using the rescaled field as the environment. The Lagrangian density of this system is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{M^2}{12} \sqrt{-g} R - \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{2} [(\nabla\Phi)^2 + m^2\Phi^2 + \xi R\Phi^2] . \quad (2.1)$$

We choose rescaled modes $\{f_n\}$ as the environment,

$$\Phi(t, \vec{x}) = \sum_n \frac{f_n(t)}{ag(a)} Y_n(\vec{x}) , \quad (2.2)$$

where $\{Y_n\}$ are normalized eigenfunctions of the Laplacian with respect to h_{ij} , and the index n is an abstract index classifying the eigenfunctions Y_n . The eigenvalue of Y_n is $-n^2 = -(k^2 - K)$.

Using the RW metric,

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -N(t)^2 dt^2 + a^2(t) h_{ij}(\vec{x}) dx^i dx^j \\ &= -N^2 dt^2 + a^2 \left(\frac{dr^2}{1 - Kr^2} + r^2 d\Omega^2 \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

the Lagrangian is written as

$$L = \frac{1}{2N} G_{\mu\nu} \dot{X}^\mu \dot{X}^\nu - NU , \quad X^\mu = (a, \{f_n\}) , \quad (2.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} U(X) &= -M^2 \frac{Ka}{2} + \frac{n^2 + m^2 a^2 + 6\xi K}{2ag^2} f_n^2 \\ &\equiv M^2 V(a) + \frac{\tilde{\omega}_n^2}{2ag^2} f_n^2 , \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{aa} \left[F^{-1} - \sum_n \left(\frac{Ma\lambda_n}{g} \right)^2 \right] & \frac{M^2 a^2}{g^2} \lambda_n \\ \frac{M^2 a^2}{g^2} \lambda_{\bar{n}} & \frac{a}{g^2} \delta_{\bar{n}n} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (2.6)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{aa} = -M^2 a , \quad \mathbf{G}^{aa} = -\frac{1}{M^2 a} , \quad (2.7)$$

$$\lambda_n = \mathbf{G}^{aa} \left(\ln \frac{g}{a^{6\xi-1}} \right)' f_n , \quad (2.8)$$

$$F = \left[1 - \frac{6\xi(1-6\xi)}{M^2 a^2 g^2(a)} \sum_n f_n^2 \right]^{-1} , \quad (2.9)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{aa}$ is the supermetric in the case of no coupling to the scalar field, and the dash represents the derivative with respect to the scale factor a .

The Hamiltonian of this system becomes

$$H = \frac{1}{2} G^{\mu\nu} P_\mu P_\nu + U , \quad (2.10)$$

$$G^{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}^{aa} F & F \lambda_n \\ F \lambda_{\bar{n}} & \frac{g^2}{a} \delta_{\bar{n}n} + F \mathbf{G}_{aa} \lambda_{\bar{n}} \lambda_n \end{pmatrix} . \quad (2.11)$$

Quantizing this system, we obtain the Wheeler-DeWitt equation,

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2} \square_G + U \right] \Psi(X^\mu) = 0 , \quad (2.12)$$

where $\square_G$ is the D'Alembertian with respect to supermetric $G_{\mu\nu}$, and the integral measure for the square of wave functions is $da \Pi_n df_n \sqrt{-G} \sim da \sqrt{-\mathbf{G}_{aa}} \Pi_n [df_n (a^{1/2}/g)]$. ■

Due to the existence of the Planck scale, we look for the solutions under the Born-Oppenheimer approximation,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(a, \{f_n\}) &= C(a) e^{iS(a)} \chi(\{f_n\} ; a) , \\ O(S(a)) &\sim O(M^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Substituting Eq.(2.13) into Eq.(2.12) and expanding in powers of M^{-2} , we obtain the Hamilton-Jacobi equation from leading term,

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{G}^{aa} (\partial_a S)^2 + M^2 V = 0 , \quad (2.14)$$

To next order in M^{-2} , we obtain the probability conservation equation and the Schrödinger equation,

$$\partial_a (\sqrt{-\mathbf{G}} \mathbf{G}^{aa} C^2 \partial_a S) = 0 , \quad (2.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& i(\mathbf{G}^{aa}\partial_a S)(\partial_a + \frac{1}{2}\partial_a \ln \frac{a^{1/2}}{g})\chi \\
& = \left[-\frac{g^2}{2a}\partial_n^2 - i\frac{\partial_a S}{2}(\lambda_n\partial_n + \partial_n\lambda_n) + \frac{\omega_n^2}{2ag^2}f_n^2 \right]\chi ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

$$\omega_n^2 = \tilde{\omega}_n^2 - 6\xi(1 - 6\xi)(\mathbf{G}^{aa}\partial_a S)^2 , \tag{2.17}$$

where we choose the prefactor C to be WKB prefactor in the case of the pure RW universe. By this choice of C , wave function of the scalar field is normalized as

$$1 = \int \Pi_n \left\{ df_n \frac{a^{1/2}}{g} \right\} |\chi|^2 . \tag{2.18}$$

We define WKB time as

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \equiv (\mathbf{G}^{aa}\partial_a S)\partial_a ,$$

so $\mathbf{G}^{aa}\partial_a S = \dot{a}/N$. Eq.(2.16) is rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[-\frac{g^2}{2a}\partial_n^2 + \frac{1}{2ag^2}\Omega_n^2 f_n^2 \right] \psi , \tag{2.19}$$

$$\psi = \left(\frac{a^{1/2}}{g} \right)^{1/2} \exp \left\{ \frac{ia}{2Ng^2} \left(\ln \frac{g}{a^{6\xi-1}} \right) \dot{f}_n^2 \right\} \chi , \tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_n^2 &= k^2 - K + a^2(m^2 + (\xi - \frac{1}{6})R) - \frac{a}{N} \left(\frac{a\dot{g}}{Ng} \right) \dot{\cdot} + \left(\frac{a\dot{g}}{Ng} \right)^2 \\
&\equiv \nu_n^2 - \frac{a}{N} \left(\frac{a\dot{g}}{Ng} \right) \dot{\cdot} + \left(\frac{a\dot{g}}{Ng} \right)^2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

In quantum mechanics, superposed states can also exist, and the general form of wave function is

$$\Psi = \sum_l C_l(a) \exp[iS_l(a)] \chi_l(\{f_n\} ; a) , \tag{2.22}$$

where the index l is a parameter that classifies the solutions of Eq.(2.14) . In our case, $l = \pm$ where $+$ ($-$) corresponds to expanding(contracting) universe, $S_- = -S_+$, and $\partial/N\partial t_- = -\partial/N\partial t_+$. Hereafter we use a "dot" to represent the derivative with respect to t_+ .

We define the density matrix of the total system and the reduced density matrix of the scale factor. First, we define the total density matrix as

$$\rho(a, \{f_n\} ; a', \{f'_n\}) = \Psi(a, \{f_n\}) \Psi^*(a', \{f'_n\}) . \quad (2.23)$$

From the bi-scalar character of the density matrix, we define the reduced density matrix as

$$\rho_{red}(a, a') = \int \prod_n \left\{ df_n \left(\frac{a^{1/2}}{g(a)} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{a'^{1/2}}{g(a')} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \rho(a, \{f_n\} ; a', \{f'_n\}) . \quad (2.24)$$

From Eq.(2.22) , we obtain

$$\rho_{red}(a, a') = \sum_{l, l'} \rho_{l, l'}^{(0)}(a, a') I_{l, l'}(a, a') , \quad (2.25)$$

$$\rho_{l, l'}^{(0)}(a, a') = C_l(a) C_{l'}^*(a') \exp[i(S_l(a) - S_{l'}(a'))] , \quad (2.26)$$

$$I_{l, l'}(a, a') = \int \prod_n df_n \exp[-\frac{i}{2}(\theta_l - \theta_{l'}) f_n^2] \psi_l(\{f_n\} ; a) \psi_{l'}^*(\{f_n\} ; a') , \quad (2.27)$$

$$\theta_l(a) = \frac{la}{Ng^2} \left(\ln \frac{g}{a^{6\xi-1}} \right) , \quad (2.28)$$

where $\rho^{(0)}$ is the density matrix in the case of a pure RW universe, and I is often called the decoherence factor. From normalization, Eq.(2.18) , at the coincidence limit, $l = l'$ and $a = a'$, we obtain $|I_{l, l}(a, a)| = 1$. Further, by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we generally obtain the inequality $|I_{l, l'}(a, a')| \leq 1$. Thus, the decoherence factor reflects the degree of decoherence of the scale factor.

3. Solution of the Schrödinger equation and Known Results

As we discussed in the previous section, to examine decoherence under the WKB ansatz, we first solve the Hamilton-Jacobi equation, Eq.(2.14) , for the background geometry, and next solve the Schrödinger equation, Eq.(2.19) , in the background geometry that is a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Finally, we estimate the decoherence factor, Eq.(2.27) .

Because there is no mode coupling in Eq.(2.19) , we deal with each mode separately. Eq.(2.19) has a quadratic form, and we seek solutions of the Gaussian form

$$\psi_{nl} = \left(\frac{\bar{B}_{nlR}}{\pi} \right)^{1/4} \exp[iA_{nl}(t) - \frac{1}{2}\bar{B}_{nl}(t)f_n^2] , \quad (3.1)$$

where $\bar{B}_{nlR} = \text{Re}(\bar{B}_{nl}) > 0$. From the Schrödinger equation Eq.(2.19) , we obtain

$$l \frac{\dot{A}_{nl}}{N} = -\frac{g^2}{2a} \bar{B}_{nlR} , \quad (3.2)$$

$$l \frac{\dot{\bar{B}}_{nl}}{N} = -i \frac{g^2}{a} \bar{B}_{nl}^2 + \frac{i}{ag^2} \Omega_n^2 . \quad (3.3)$$

We introduce the variable u_{nl} as

$$\bar{B}_{nl} = -i \frac{la}{Ng^2} [\ln u_{nl}^* + \ln g] , \quad (3.4)$$

and Eq.(3.3) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a}{N} \left(\frac{a}{N} \dot{u}_{nl} \right) + \nu_n^2 u_{nl} &= 0 , \\ \nu_n^2 &= k^2 + a^2 [m^2 + (\xi - \frac{1}{6})R] . \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Eq.(3.5) is just the Klein-Gordon equation. So u_{nl} is a mode function, and the choice of the mode function corresponds to the initial condition of the wave function, ψ_{nl} .

In the Gaussian form, Eq.(3.1) , the decoherence factor, Eq.(2.27) is written as

$$I_{l,l'}(a, a') = \prod_n \exp[i(A_{nl}(a) - A_{nl'}(a'))] \left[\frac{4B_{nlR}(a)B_{nl'R}(a')}{(B_{nl}(a) + B_{nl'}^*(a'))^2} \right]^{1/4}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$B_{nl}(a) = \bar{B}_{nl}(a) + i \theta_l(a) = -i \frac{la}{Ng^2} [\ln u_{nl}^* + (6\xi - 1) \ln a]. \quad (3.7)$$

Let us try to apply the procedures described above to some models. First, we consider the case of a massless minimally coupled field on the deSitter background as a zeroth order WKB solution.^[11] If we choose the deSitter invariant vacuum as the boundary condition of the mode functions, the functions B_{nl} are given by

$$B_{nl}(a) = (k^2 - 1)a^2 \frac{k + i l (H^2 a^2 - 1)^{1/2}}{k^2 + H^2 a^2 - 1}, \quad (3.8)$$

where we chose the rescaling $g(a) = a^{-1}$. So we obtain^[11]

$$|I_{l,l'}(a, a')| = \prod_{k=2} \left[1 + \frac{(a^2 - a'^2)^2}{4a^2 a'^2} + \frac{(a'^2 l \sqrt{H^2 a^2 - 1} - a^2 l' \sqrt{H^2 a'^2 - 1})^2}{4k^2 a^2 a'^2} \right]^{-k^2/4}. \quad (3.9)$$

By calculating the infinite product, we obtain perfect decoherence between the expanding universe and contracting one, and perfect decoherence within a WKB branch,

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{+-}(a, a)| &= \prod_{k=2} \left[1 + \frac{H^2 a^2 - 1}{k^2} \right]^{-k^2/4} = 0, \\ |I_{l,l}(a, a')| &< \prod_{k=2} \left[1 + \frac{(a^2 - a'^2)^2}{4a^2 a'^2} \right]^{-k^2/4} = 0 \quad \text{for } a \neq a'. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Next we consider the case of a massive conformally coupled field on an adiabatically evolving universe.^{[15][16][18]} Let us set, at scale factor $a = a_0$, the initial condition of the scalar field as in-vacuum and choose the rescaling $g(a) = 1$ and

$N = a$. Using Bogoliubov coefficients, which are estimated by a standard WKB technique, the in-vacuum is related to the adiabatic out-vacuum as

$$\begin{aligned}
u_n^{in} &= \alpha_n u_n^{out} + \beta_n u_n^{out*} , \\
u_n^{out} &\sim \frac{\exp(-i \int^\eta \nu_n d\eta')}{(2\nu_n)^{1/2}} , \\
\beta_n &= \frac{i}{2} \exp[-\frac{\gamma}{2}(k^2 + m^2 a_0^2)] , \quad \gamma = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{m^2 a_0 V'(a_0)}} , \\
\alpha_n &\sim 1 .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Thus

$$B_{n+}(a) = \nu_n \left[\frac{\alpha_n^* - \beta_n^* u_n / u_n^{out*}}{\alpha_n^* + \beta_n^* u_n^{out} / u_n^{out*}} \right] + i \frac{\dot{\nu}_n}{2\nu_n} = B_{n-}^*(a) . \tag{3.12}$$

The norm of the decoherence factor between the expanding universe and contracting universe is given by^{[18] [16]}

$$|I_{+-}(a, a)| = \prod_{k=2}^{\infty} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\nu_n^2} \left\{ 2|\beta_n| \cos(2 \int^\eta \nu_n) - \frac{\dot{\nu}_n}{2\nu_n^2} \right\}^2 \right]^{k^2/4} , \tag{3.13}$$

and due to $O(\nu_n^{-2}) = O(\dot{\nu}_n/\nu_n^2) = O(k^{-2})$, the infinite product on the R.H.S. of Eq.(3.13) is convergent, so that moderate decoherence results. Similarly the decoherence factor within a WKB branch is also calculated, and it does not vanish.^[15]

4. Constraints on rescaling and curvature coupling constant

We would like to know how the scale factor decoheres. Thus we concentrate on the norm of the decoherence factor,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{l,l'}(a, a')| &= \prod_n \left[\frac{4B_{nlR}(a)B_{nl'R}(a')}{|B_{nl}(a) + B_{nl'}^*(a')|^2} \right]^{1/4} \\
&= \prod_n \left[1 - \frac{|B_{nl}(a) - B_{nl'}(a')|^2}{|B_{nl}(a) + B_{nl'}^*(a')|^2} \right]^{1/4} .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

By virtue of a well known theorem for infinite products, the divergence of Eq.(4.1) is

equivalent to that of

$$\sum_n \frac{|B_{nl}(a) - B_{nl'}(a')|^2}{|B_{nl}(a) + B_{nl'}^*(a')|^2} . \quad (4.2)$$

In our case, in the large k limit we can replace the summation for mode k into an integral over k :

$$\sum_n \longrightarrow \int dk k^2 .$$

If Eq.(4.2) is convergent, it must hold that for large k ,

$$\frac{|B_{nl}(a) - B_{nl'}(a')|^2}{|B_{nl}(a) + B_{nl'}^*(a')|^2} \sim o(k^{-3}) . \quad (4.3)$$

In order to obtain the constraints for the decoherence factor to be finite, we attach some physically reasonable conditions to the mode functions. We expect that at each time we can have a particle picture and that the Fock representation set at each time can be related unitary equivalently, *i.e.*, Bogoliubov implementability.

This Bogoliubov implementability gives some constraints on the behavior of the mode function in the large k limit:^[20]

$$\mu_{nl} \equiv \text{Re} \left[-i \frac{la}{N} \frac{\dot{u}_{nl}^*}{u_{nl}^*} \right] \quad (4.4)$$

$$\sim \nu_n + o(k^{-1/2}) , \quad (4.5)$$

$$\gamma_n \equiv -\text{Im} \left[-i \frac{la}{N} \frac{\dot{u}_{nl}^*}{u_{nl}^*} \right] \quad (4.6)$$

$$\sim o(k^{-1/2}) . \quad (4.7)$$

For example, the behavior of each Eqs.(4.4) and (4.6) in the large k limit for adiabatic vacuum is, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{nl} &= \nu_n + o(k^{-2}) , \\ \gamma_{nl} &= o(k^{-2}) , \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

so that Eqs.(4.5) and (4.7) hold. For the Hamiltonian diagonalization vacuum,

the behavior of Eq.(4.6) in the large k limit is

$$\gamma_{nl} = (1 - 6\xi) \frac{l\dot{a}}{Na} , \quad (4.9)$$

so that Eq.(4.7) does not hold, except for when $\xi = 1/6$.^{[19][20]}

Under the WKB ansatz, Eq.(2.22) , we take the constraints Eqs.(4.5) and (4.7) for granted because the back reaction correction to the background evolution should be a small finite quantity so that the particle production is finite.

Due to the constraints (4.5) and (4.7) ,

$$B_{nl} = \frac{1}{g^2} \left[\mu_{nl} - i\gamma_{nl} + i \frac{la}{N} (\ln a^{1-6\xi}) \cdot \right] \sim O(k) , \quad (4.10)$$

and thus, from Eq.(4.3) , we obtain the constraint

$$|B_{nl}(a) - B_{nl'}(a')|^2 \sim o(k^{-1}) . \quad (4.11)$$

From Eq.(4.11) , we derive the constraints on rescaling $g(a)$ and the curvature coupling constant to obtain moderate decoherence.

4.1. DECOHERENCE BETWEEN DIFFERENT WKB BRANCHES

As different WKB branches in our model, we have the expanding universe and contracting universe. First, we examine the decoherence between these two states. Its degree is measured by

$$|I_{+-}(a, a)| = \prod_n \left[1 - \frac{|B_{n+}(a) - B_{n-}(a)|^2}{|B_{n+}(a) + B_{n-}^*(a)|^2} \right]^{1/4} , \quad (4.12)$$

and its convergence is equivalent to Eq.(4.11) with $a' = a$:

$$|B_{n+}(a) - B_{n-}(a)|^2 = \frac{1}{g^4} \left[(\mu_{n+} - \mu_{n-})^2 + \{ \gamma_{n+} - \gamma_{n-} - 2i \frac{a}{N} (\ln a^{1-6\xi}) \cdot \}^2 \right] \sim o(k^{-1}) . \quad (4.13)$$

Under Eqs.(4.5) and (4.7) , for the decoherence factor, Eq.(4.12) , to be finite, we

obtain the constraint on the curvature coupling constant

$$\xi = \frac{1}{6} , \quad (4.14)$$

i.e., conformal coupling.

4.2. DECOHERENCE WITHIN A WKB BRANCH

Next we examine decoherence of the scale factor within a WKB branch. We omit the index l in the decoherence factor, and so on. The degree of decoherence is measured by

$$|I(a, a')| = \prod_n \left[1 - \frac{|B_n(a) - B_n(a')|^2}{|B_n(a) + B_n^*(a')|^2} \right]^{1/4} . \quad (4.15)$$

Its convergence is equivalent to Eq.(4.11) with $l' = l$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |B_n(a) - B_n(a')|^2 &= \left(\frac{\mu_n(a)}{g^2(a)} - \frac{\mu_n(a')}{g^2(a')} \right)^2 \\ &+ \left[\frac{\gamma_n(a) - \frac{a}{N}(\ln a^{1-6\xi})}{g^2(a)} - \frac{\gamma_n(a') - \frac{a'}{N}(\ln a'^{1-6\xi})}{g^2(a')} \right]^2 . \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Under Eqs.(4.5)and (4.7) , for the decoherence factor, Eq.(4.15) , to be finite, we obtain the constraint for rescaling, $g(a)$, and the curvature coupling constant:

$$\begin{aligned} g(a) &= \text{constant} , \\ \xi &= \frac{1}{6} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

5. Summary and Discussion

In the previous section we obtained the constraints on the rescaling $g(a)$ and the curvature coupling constant to make decoherence moderate *irrespective of the evolution of the scale factor*. Therefore, if the constraints (4.17) do not hold, we cannot obtain moderate decoherence, even with adiabaticity of the evolution of the scale factor, except for in a static region. Even though we choose the initial condition of the state of the scalar field to be a physically reasonable state leading to finite particle production, we have perfect decoherence unless the constraints (4.17) hold. So the divergence of the decoherence factor is not attributed to the lack of adiabaticity of the zeroth order WKB solution, but to *system/environment* coupling and *system/environment* splitting. The former is of dynamical origin, but the latter is simply of kinematical origin.

Our result, Eq.(4.17), is understood as follows. Because we deal with an environment with an infinite number of degrees of freedom, for the decoherence factor not to vanish, both $\chi_l(a)$ and $\chi_{l'}(a')$ must belong to the same Hilbert space. In other words, the states of almost all modes in $\chi_l(a)$ should be nearly equal to the corresponding modes in $\chi_{l'}(a')$. Let us consider the case that $|I_{l,l'}(a, a')| = 1$, so that the scalar field essentially has no coupling to the scale factor. This is the case when we choose $g(a) = 1$ for the massless conformal coupled scalar. Unless we choose $g(a) = 1$, the effective frequency of each mode is $\Omega_{eff} = k/g^4(a)$ and the scale factor strongly couples to modes irrespective of k , $\partial_a \Omega_{eff}/\Omega_{eff} \sim O(k^0)$. Even if we choose $g(a) = 1$, in the case of non-conformal coupling, we have momentum-momentum coupling, and this gives not only a -dependence but also direct l -dependence through $\partial_a S_l$ to the covariance, $B_{nl}(a)$, of the wave functions of all modes. Therefore, the choice of $g(a) \neq 1$ and non-conformal coupling induce certain differences to all modes, so that the overlap integral vanishes. Meanwhile, the mass term is ineffective for large k modes and it has no constraint.

We calculate the quantities among a wider class in discussing decoherence than in ordinarily discussing field theory on a curved space. On the decoherence

argument, we calculate the overlap integral between the states with the same initial condition *at different times and in different universes*. On the other hand, for example, particle creation is calculated by making a comparison between different states *at the same time and in the same universe*. In usual arguments for field theory on a curved space, rescaling $g(a)$ and ξ are ineffective. For example, in discussing that two particle models belong to the same Hilbert space, we, in the Schrödinger picture, calculate the decoherence functional for $l' = l$ (same universe) and $a' = a$ (same time), but for different particle models ($\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$):

$$|I(a, a)| = \prod_n \left[1 - \frac{|B_n(a) - B'_n(a)|^2}{|B_n(a) + B_n'^*(a)|^2} \right]^{1/4}, \quad (5.1)$$

where B_n and B'_n are written as

$$B_n(a) = -\frac{ia}{Ng^2(a)} \left[\ln u_n^*(a) + \ln a^{1-6\xi} \right], \quad (5.2)$$

$$B'_n(a) = -\frac{ia}{Ng^2(a)} \left[\ln v_n^*(a) + \ln a^{1-6\xi} \right]. \quad (5.3)$$

Therefore we obtain the well known result

$$\begin{aligned} |I(a, a)| &= \prod_n \left[1 - \frac{|\dot{u}^* v^* - u^* \dot{v}^*|^2}{|\dot{u}^* v - u^* \dot{v}|^2} \right]^{1/4} \\ &= \prod_n \left[1 - \frac{|\beta_n|^2}{|\alpha_n|^2} \right]^{1/4} = \prod_n |\alpha_n|^{-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where $v_n = \alpha_n u_n + \beta_n u_n^*$ and the index l is omitted. Thus by requiring Eq.(5.4) to be convergent, we obtain the constraints only on mode functions, and these are nothing more than Eqs.(4.5) and (4.7).

In an anisotropic universe, even if we choose $g(a) = 1$, modes tightly couple to geometry irrespective of k , $\partial\Omega_n/\Omega_n = [\partial(e^{2\beta})_{ij} k^i k^j + \dots]/[(e^{2\beta})_{ij} k^i k^j + \dots] \sim O(k^0)$. We believe that in anisotropic case, the decoherence factor must vanish. Further, it is known that there is no particle model which leads to finite particle production.^[19] This may make the WKB ansatz, Eq.(2.13), invalid.

As described in the Introduction, we have the arbitrariness of defining the reduced density matrix, *i.e.*, one of *system/environment* splitting. At least in isotropic case, the arbitrariness is important to obtain the moderate decoherence that is necessary for the classical correlation criterion to hold. By requiring moderate decoherence, we can obtain a *system/environment* splitting, $g(a) = \text{constant}$, which is characterized by no coupling between the geometry and scalar field in the large k limit.

If we really need moderate decoherence, it may fix a part of the arbitrariness of the *system/environment* splitting in a sense.

Acknowledgements: The author is grateful to Professor A.Hosoya and Professor H.Ishihara for comments and careful reading of the manuscript. The author would like to thanks the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for financial support. This work was supported in part by the Japanese Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

REFERENCES

1. R.Geroch, *Nous* **18**(1984),617.
2. J.B.Hartle, in *Gravitation in Astrophysics*, proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute, Cargese, France, 1986, edited by B.Carter and J.Hartle (NATO ASI Series B:Physics, Vol.156)(Plenum, New York, 1987).
3. J.J.Halliwell, *Phys.Rev.***D36**(1987),3626.
4. S.Habib, *Phys.Rev.***D42**(1990),2566.
5. M.V.Berry, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.***287**(1977),237.
6. S.Habib and R.Laflamme, *Phy.Rev.***D42**(1990),4056.
7. B.d'Espagnat, *Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Benjamin, Menlo Park, Calif., 1971).

8. M.Gell-Mann and J.B.Hartle, in *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*, edited by W.H.Zurek, Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity Vol.VIII (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1990).
9. M.Morikawa, Phys.Rev.**D42**(1990),2929.
10. W.H.Zurek, Phys.Rev.**D24**(1981),1516;**26**(1982),1862.
11. J.J.Halliwell, Phys.Rev.**D39**(1989),2912.
12. C.Kiefer, Class.Quantum.Grav.**4**(1987),1369.
13. T.Padmanabhan, Phys.Rev.**D39**(1989),2924.
14. M.Morikawa, Phys.Rev.**D40**(1989),4023.
15. J.P.Paz and S.Sinha, Phys.Rev.**D44**(1991),1038.
16. J.P.Paz and S.Sinha, Phys.Rev.**D45**(1992),2823.
17. R.Laflamme and J.Louko, Phys.Rev.**D43**(1991),3317.
18. E.Calzetta and F.Mazzitelli, Phys.Rev.**D42**(1990),4066.
19. S.A.Fulling, Gen.Rel.Grav.**10**(1979),807.
20. H.Kodama, Prog.Theor.Phys.**65**(1981),507.